REMARKS

I.   Summary of the Office Action and this Reply

Claims 7-8, 27-38, 56 and 60 are pending. Claims 7-8, 27-38, 56 and 60

have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over the Sanders article. Claim 60 has

also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), asserting that such claim is anticipated

by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,350 to LaMaire et al. ("LaMaire").

In this Reply, claims 7, 8 and 56 are amended; claim 60 is canceled. New

claim 76 is added; no new matter is added.

II.   Discussion

The Claimed Invention

Reference is made to the discussion in Applicants' Reply mailed April 17,

2003, where it is discussed in detail that users can receive individual files in various

formats and/or resolutions, with a corresponding savings in network resources and

latency for selection of smaller, lower resolution versions of files. Page 12, lines 3-

22. Further, in certain embodiments, the user is presented with a menu of available

user-selectable versions of a particular such that the file that is delivered to a

requesting client is specified by the user on a per-request basis.

U.S. Patent No. to 6,343,350 to LaMaire

LaMaire discloses a system that allows for derivation and storage in a cache

of low resolution versions of data objects. For example, image resolution reduction

may be achieved by decoding and reencoding (i.e. transcoding) images with fewer

pixels, fewer colors, etc. The cache may be implemented at a proxy. The proxy

may automatically reduce the resolution of network objects as they pass through the

proxy so as to conserve communication bandwidth on the link between the proxy

and the client. High resolution versions of network objects are intercepted, and a

low resolution version of the object is stored along with the high resolution in the

network cache. The low resolution version is sent to the client instead of the high

resolution version. The high resolution version is available upon request. Col. 7,

lines 20-50.

The Sanders Article

The Sanders Article discloses a service allowing users to route web requests

through a transformational proxy that gives users slightly lower quality images but

much faster access. The proxy allows users to receive a lower quality image quickly,

and then to optionally download the full image only if desired.

III.   Response to 102 Rejections

In paragraphs 4-6 of the Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 27-38, 56

and 60 over the Sanders article. Claims 7, 8 and 56 have been amended; claim 60

has been canceled.

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is proper only if each and every element of

the claim is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.

Claims 7, 8 and 76

Claim 7 is directed to a method involving deriving by conversion a user-

selected version of a target file from a materialized (stored) version of the target file

that has the desired information content such that a version may be provided that is

lower in resolution or different in format from the file that is stored by the server. The

claim recites "<u>transmitting, from the deriving computer to the client, a program for</u>

<u>generating and displaying at the client a menu of user-selectable versions of the</u>

target file." See application, page 20, lines 23-25. This is neither taught nor suggested by Sanders or LaMaire. Amended claim 8 further recites <u>generating and displaying at the client a menu of user-selectable versions of the target file</u>. This is neither taught nor suggested by Sanders or LaMaire.

Further, new claim 76 further recites that the request from the client for the user-selected version is made responsive to a user's selection from the menu.. This is neither taught nor suggested by Sanders or LaMaire.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7 and 8, and allowance of new claim 76, are requested respectfully.

Claims 27-38

Claim 27 is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 7. In particular, claim 27 recites responsive to selection of a hyperlink, <u>generating and displaying, at the client, a menu of user-selectable versions of the target file</u>, at least one user-selectable version being derivable by conversion from a materialized version, the at least one user-selectable version not being materialized; selecting, at the client, a user-selected version of the target file from the menu; and receiving, at the client, the user-selected version of the target file. As discussed above, neither Sanders nor LaMaire teaches or suggests such a menu. Claims 28-38 depend from claim 27 and are likewise patentable. Additionally, claims 29-32 include further recitations relating to the menu.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 27-38 are requested respectfully.

<u>Claim 56</u>

Claim 56 is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above for claims 7 and 27. In particular, claim 56 recites <u>transmitting from the proxy a program for generating and displaying at the client a menu of user-selectable versions of a file to a client along with a default version of the file.</u> As discussed above, neither Sanders nor LaMaire teaches or suggests such a menu or transmission of such a menu-generating program.

For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 56 are requested respectfully.

<h2 style="text-align:center"><u>CONCLUSION</u></h2>

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 7, 8, and 27-38, 56 and 76 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If any issues remain, the undersigned requests a telephone interview prior to the issuance of an action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>June 29, 2004</u>

Gregory S. Bernabeo
Reg. No. 44,032

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189